



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,655	11/16/2005	Masanori Naritomi	052496	1376
38834 7590 12/06/2010 WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER KRUER, KEVIN R	
			ART UNIT 1787	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/06/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

Advisory Action

Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/2010 have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Furthermore, the proposed amendment has not been entered because it raises new issues that would require further search and/or consideration and because it is not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing and/or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Specifically, Applicant argues Akahoshi fails to teach or render obvious the claimed hydrazine treatment because the reducing agent taught therein does not correspond to hydrazine monohydrate. Said argument is not persuasive because Akahoshi teaches hydrazines may be used as the reducing agent (col 4, lines 7+).

Applicant further argues Akahoshi teaches that hydrazine fails to reduce the copper oxide to attain metallization and that reducing to aluminum oxide would be harder than reduction of copper oxide. Said argument is noted but is not persuasive because counsel's arguments cannot take the place of evidence.

Applicant further argues the claimed reaction involves a basis, not a redox reaction. Said argument is not persuasive for the reasons noted in the 9/2/2010 Final Rejection. Specifically, the argument is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention (no reaction is claimed) and is not supported by the original disclosure.

For the reasons noted above, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1787

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN R. KRUEER whose telephone number is (571)272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571-272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin R Krueer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1787